

REMARKS

The Official Action mailed March 13, 2006, has been received and its contents carefully noted. This response is filed within three months of the mailing date of the Official Action and therefore is believed to be timely without extension of time. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully submits that this response is being timely filed.

The Applicant notes with appreciation the consideration of the Information Disclosure Statements filed on April 9, 2004; April 22, 2004; and August 29, 2005.

Claims 33-42 and 45-63 are pending in the present application, of which claims 33, 34, 41 and 50-52 are independent. Independent claims 33, 34, 41 and 50-52 have been amended to better recite the features of the present invention. For the reasons set forth in detail below, all claims are believed to be in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration is requested.

In response to a request in the Official Action, the Applicant will correct any errors in the specification of which the Applicant becomes aware.

The Official Action rejects claims 33-42 and 45-63 as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,893,990 to Tanaka. The Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection because the Official Action has not established an anticipation rejection.

As stated in MPEP § 2131, to establish an anticipation rejection, each and every element as set forth in the claim must be described either expressly or inherently in a single prior art reference. Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987).

Independent claims 33, 34, 51 and 52 recite forming a crystalline semiconductor film by irradiating an energy beam output continuously. Independent claims 41 and 50 recite crystallizing the semiconductor film by irradiating an energy beam output continuously. The independent claims have also been amended for clarity. For the reasons provided below, the Applicant respectfully submits that Tanaka does not teach the above-referenced features of the present invention, either explicitly or inherently.

The Official Action asserts that Tanaka discloses the following (page 3, Paper No. 0306; emphasis added):


... a method for manufacturing a thin film transistor comprising the steps of: forming a crystalline semiconductor film 76 by irradiating an energy beam output continuously while scanning the energy beam to a semiconductor film (figure 7C; col. 9, lines 55-59); forming a gate electrode 106 over the crystalline semiconductor film (figure 10B; col. 11, lines 10-15 and 39-56); and forming an impurity region 111/113/114/112 in the crystalline semiconductor film using the gate electrode as a mask (figure 11B; col. 12, lines 15-24), wherein a scanning direction of the beam changes outside an element-forming region formed with the semiconductor film (figures 8A-9; col. 10, lines 36-42 and 52-62).

However, despite the above assertion, Tanaka does not teach that a beam for irradiation is output continuously, either explicitly or inherently. Rather, Tanaka appears to teach that "film 75 is irradiated with an excimer laser of a large power pulse laser to form the crystalline silicon film 76" (column 9, lines 55-59; emphasis added).

Since Tanaka does not teach all the elements of the independent claims, either explicitly or inherently, an anticipation rejection cannot be maintained. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102 are in order and respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable to place this application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,



Eric J. Robinson
Reg. No. 38,285

Robinson Intellectual Property Law Office, P.C.
PMB 955
21010 Southbank Street
Potomac Falls, Virginia 20165
(571) 434-6789